

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of all the claims now in the application (i.e., claims 15-18, 20, 23-36) is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially the Examiner rejected the claims as being indefinite for the reasons listed on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

The Examiner then rejected claims 12, 13 and 19-22 as being anticipated by Saila U.S. Patent No. 4,538,485. Claims 14-18 and 23-25 were rejected as being obvious over Saila. Applicants have cancelled claims 12-14, 19 and 20-22. Applicants have amended claim 23 to require a leaf spring mounted on the first member having a first and second ends spaced along the length of the first member. The claim requires the leaf spring to have a length greater than the straight line distance between its end points so that the leaf spring is curved and can lie on either side of a straight line connecting the first and second ends of the spring. The claim requires that a locking element be provided on the first member for moving the leaf spring from one side of the straight line to the other side of the straight line. This structure is described in paragraph 25 of the application.

Clearly Saila discloses a coil spring which does not have first and second ends mounted on the first member and furthermore cannot be selectively deflected so that it may lie on either side of a straight line connecting its ends. Obviously a coil spring cannot be deflected to one side of a straight line connecting its ends as now claimed. Such a structure is not taught or suggested by Saila and allows the locking element on the first member to either be positively held in engagement or out of engagement with the locking element on the second member. This is of course impossible with a coil

spring since, as shown in Saila, the spring element always acts to keep the notch of element 48 engaged in the teeth of element 28. A separate locking system is required to keep the tooth of element 48 out of engagement with the teeth as shown in FIG. 3 of Saila.

New claims 26-36 have been added which limit the locking or catching elements to those having a changing radius of curvature to provide locking. This structure can be seen for example in FIGS. 9-12 of the present application. It is clear from these figures that elements 35 and 37 has the claim changing radius of curvature. Obviously, this structure is not shown in Saila nor any of the other prior art referenced by the Examiner.

Consequently, Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that she telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which she might have.

Application No.: 10/532,180

Docket No.: TRAUMA 3.3-437

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raymond W. Augustin

Registration No.: 28,588

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

LD-447\